

CULTURAL DIVERSITY  
AND THE BREAKDOWN  
OF BYZANTINE POWER  
IN ASIA MINOR

PETER CHARANIS

The following paper is substantially the same as that delivered at the Symposium on "The Decline of Byzantine Civilization in Asia Minor, Eleventh—Fifteenth Century," held at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1974.

IN the seventh century the Roman Empire, which we may now call the Byzantine Empire, lost Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and its Mesopotamian and Armenian possessions. By the end of that century, the Arabs were in control of all of Armenia and in 708 they took Tyana. A zone, varied in width, with one end located on the coast of the Black Sea some distance to the east of Trebizond, and the other end on the Mediterranean east of Seluceia on the Calycadnus, extended along the upper reaches of the Lycus east of Nikopolis and of the Halys east of Sebasteia, and along the Taurus mountains, and thenceforth for some two hundred and fifty years constituted the frontier of the Byzantine Empire in Asia Minor. Byzantium had been able to retain effective control over the western regions and, excepting Cilicia, the central plateau of Asia Minor.<sup>1</sup> Although the Empire lost the greater part of its possessions in the Balkan peninsula, the retention of Asia Minor finally saved it, and enabled it to reestablish itself as a great power. Byzantine Asia Minor, at least among the Arabs, became synonymous with the Byzantine Empire.<sup>2</sup>

Norman Baynes, who believed that the essential condition of the prosperity of the Byzantine Empire was its possession of Asia Minor, refers to the latter as "that reservoir alike of money and of men."<sup>3</sup> Asia Minor was, of course, rich in natural resources and was in possession of the techniques developed in the ancient world for their exploitation.<sup>4</sup> But the extent of the abundant supply of money—usable wealth is a more appropriate expression—depends upon a large and thriving population, and on this question of the size of the population of Byzantine Asia Minor the sources permit no categorical answer.

It has been estimated that the regions which came to constitute Byzantine Asia Minor had a combined population of about 11,800,000 toward the end of the second century A.D. This estimate, the compiler adds, "probably errs by being too small."<sup>5</sup> In the third century the population of these regions suffered a decline, but this decline was checked sometime in the fourth century, and by the end of the fifth there was a recovery. A new demographic crisis began in 541 with the outbreak of the first of a series of deadly pestilences which would plague Asia Minor, particularly its western region, which was also its most populous, throughout the sixth, seventh, and part of the eighth centuries. During the same period, Asia Minor was subjected on an almost annual basis to devastating raids by the Persians and, especially, by the Arabs. It may be taken as certain, therefore, that from about the middle of

<sup>1</sup> On the Byzantine frontiers in Asia Minor, the principal book remains, of course, E. Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches* (Brussels, 1935), 43 ff.

<sup>2</sup> D. J. Georgacas, *The Names for the Asia Minor Peninsula and a Register of Surviving Anatolian Pre-Turkish Placenames* (= Beiträge zur Namenforschung, n.f. 8) (Heidelberg, 1971), 69 f., 77.

<sup>3</sup> *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London, 1955), 92.

<sup>4</sup> T. R. S. Broughton, "Roman Asia Minor," in T. Frank, ed., *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, IV (Baltimore, 1938), 599 ff.; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950), II, 34 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Broughton, *op. cit.*, 815.

the sixth century the number of its inhabitants began to decline, and that the decline continued, sometimes less, sometimes more, throughout the seventh and eighth centuries.<sup>6</sup> The emperors were aware of this and tried to remedy the situation by settling new peoples. The anti-monastic measures of Constantine V may also have had a demographic basis.<sup>7</sup> By the beginning of the ninth century the situation began to improve. The information for this is meager, but it is known at least that Asia Minor was no longer subjected to the almost continuous Arab raids which, in the preceding centuries, contributed so much to the thinning of its population. There are a few references to the existence of some fairly large and prosperous cities; there was an increase in the number of episcopal sees;<sup>8</sup> and, as Ostrogorsky remarks, the insatiable drive of the landed aristocracy in the tenth century for more land presupposes a certain degree of abundance of agricultural labor.<sup>9</sup> J. C. Russell, whose estimate of ancient and medieval populations is notoriously low, puts the population of Byzantine Asia Minor around A.D. 800 at about 8 million.<sup>10</sup> There is no solid basis for Russell's figure or, indeed, for any figure; nevertheless the impression is strong that by the end of the ninth century and during the tenth century Byzantine Asia Minor was a well-populated land. Ibn Hauqal, the tenth-century Arab geographer who considered the Byzantine Empire much inferior in population and wealth to Maghrib, the realm of the Fatimes in North Africa, says about the western regions of Asia Minor: "The territory which separates the two cities [Attaleia and Constantinople] is fertile and well peopled. From the suburbs of Attaleia and its flourishing and very productive rural districts to the straits of Constantinople the traffic is uninterrupted all along the route."<sup>11</sup> The population of Asia Minor was not, of course, evenly distributed throughout the peninsula. Regions of the central plateau were certainly not as densely populated as the great river valleys.

Broughton's estimate of the population of Asia Minor in the second century A.D., which I gave at the beginning of this paper, was based on various features of Asia Minor: the extent of its fertile valleys, its forests and mountains, and the wetness or dryness of its climate. But the factor which entered most heavily into his calculations was the existence of a considerable number of cities, some with a population running into tens or, in several instances, hundreds of thousands of people.<sup>12</sup> In the period which followed through the end of the sixth century, these cities underwent significant changes, both in their administration and in the size and quality of their populations. They

<sup>6</sup> P. Charanis, *Studies on the Demography of the Byzantine Empire. Collected Studies* (London, 1972), study I, pp. 9, 10, 11, 13. Cf. H. Ahrweiler, "L'Asie Mineure et les invasions Arabes (VII<sup>e</sup>-IX<sup>e</sup> siècles)," *RH*, 227 (1962), 13ff.

<sup>7</sup> P. Charanis, "The Monk as an Element of Byzantine Society," *DOP*, 25 (1971), 66f.

<sup>8</sup> *Idem*, *Studies on the Demography*, study I, p. 13.

<sup>9</sup> G. Ostrogorsky, "Das Steuersystem im byzantinischen Altertum und Mittelalter," *Byzantion*, 6 (1931), 233.

<sup>10</sup> *Late Ancient and Medieval Population* (= *TAPS*, n.s. 48, pt. 3) (Philadelphia, 1958), 148.

<sup>11</sup> Ibn Hauqal, *Configuration de la Terre*, French trans. J. H. Kramers and G. Wiet (Paris, 1964), I, 196f.

<sup>12</sup> Broughton, *op. cit.*, 815.

continued, nevertheless, to constitute an important element of the geography of Asia Minor.<sup>13</sup>

The irruption of the Arabs in the seventh century and the disturbances which they caused in Asia Minor in the course of that and the next two centuries did not leave the cities of that peninsula unaffected. In the opinion of some scholars, these cities declined to such an extent that for all practical purposes they may be said to have ceased to exist. This opinion has been based largely on numismatic and archaeological evidence drawn from only two or three sites, and as a consequence its general import has been questioned on this and on other grounds.<sup>14</sup> There is information, however, drawn from Moslem geographers, which seems to support it.

Ibn Hauqal, whom I have already cited in another connection, says, concerning the number of cities in the Byzantine Empire: "Despite its territorial extent, the continuity of its duration, and its condition, rich cities are less numerous in the Byzantine Empire; in fact, the largest part of it is made up of mountains, of citadels and of fortresses, of troglodytic villages, and of small towns with houses cut into the rocks or dug underground."<sup>15</sup> And the author of the *Hudūd al-ʿĀlam*, a geographical compilation composed in Persian around 982 and drawn from earlier Arab geographers, writes: "In the days of old cities were numerous in Rūm..., but now they have become few. Most of the districts...are prosperous and pleasant, and have (each) an extremely strong fortress..., on account of the frequency of the raids... which the fighters for the faith...direct upon them."<sup>16</sup> The inference seems clear: in the course of their penetrations of Asia Minor over a period of about two hundred years, the Arabs brought ruination upon the cities of that peninsula.

That the Arabs captured, devastated, and, in some instances, left in ruins important Byzantine cities in Asia Minor is known, of course, from other sources, both Arab and Greek. A perusal of the Byzantine chroniclers and the Arabic sources translated by Brooks, and by Vasiliev, Grégoire, and Canard has revealed the following cities which at one time or another in the course of

<sup>13</sup> For a general survey of the cities of Asia Minor to the end of the reign of Justinian, see A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1971), 28–225. For the Byzantine city in general in the sixth century, see D. Claude, *Die byzantinische Stadt im 6. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1969).

<sup>14</sup> The question has been discussed by G. Ostrogorsky, "Byzantine Cities in the Early Middle Ages," *DOP*, 13 (1959), 45–66; cf. Charanis, *Studies on the Demography*, study I, p. 7. The excavations at Sardis and the publication of the Byzantine coins found there have revived the issue; see G. E. Bates, *Archaeological Exploration of Sardis. Byzantine Coins* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971), 1–3: "The coins give a fairly precise date for the final destruction of Sardis. The evidence of widespread destruction and burning, the presence in the burned layers of larger numbers of Byzantine copper coins dating from 491 to the year 616 and not thereafter, and the lack of signs of reconstruction argue for the destruction of the city no earlier than 616.... It is thought that for some years the Persian armies were engaged in extensive raiding of western Asia Minor. There is thus the probability that Sardis was captured and destroyed by one of these raiding armies in 616.... I conclude that the city was destroyed in 616.... Coins found thus far provide no evidence of substantial resettlement after 616 until at least the end of the tenth century." But see P. Charanis, "A Note on the Byzantine Coin Finds in Sardis and their Historical Significance," *Επ.Ετ.Βυλ.Σπ.*, 39–40 (1972–73), 175–80.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, I, 194f.

<sup>16</sup> *Hudūd al-ʿĀlam*, trans. and commentary by V. Minorsky (London, 1937), 157.

the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries were captured by the Arabs: Abydus, Acroinon, Amaseia, Amisus, Amorion, Ancyra, Antioch in Pisidia, Caesarea, Cyzicus, Heracleia in Cappadocia, Ikonion, Laodiceia Catacecaumene, Nicomedia, Nyssa, Synada in Phrygia, Thebasa in Lycaonia.<sup>17</sup>

Let us look more closely, however, into the testimony of the Moslem geographers. Ibn Hauqal was a propagandist for the Fatimides of North Africa.<sup>18</sup> He attributed the successes of the Byzantine Empire against Islam in the tenth century not to its strength, but to the weakness of the Moslems. In his opinion the Byzantine Empire was poor, its resources considerably less than was generally believed among the Moslems.<sup>19</sup> His statement, therefore, that the Byzantine Empire had few rich cities, because it puts the emphasis on the rich, loses some of its significance, and in the final analysis is irrelevant to the broader question of how numerous were the cities in the Byzantine Empire. Ibn Hauqal, however, does speak of the existence of numerous fortresses, which were not isolated structures built here and there throughout the countryside. They were fortified, inhabited localities whose population often ran into thousands. Amorion, for instance, often referred to as a fortress, may have had a population of about 40,000 just before its devastation by the Arabs in 838.<sup>20</sup> Besides, the reference to "troglodytic villages and towns with houses cut into the rocks or dug underground" indicates that Ibn Hauqal may have had in mind those parts of Asia Minor which were never famous for their cities. The situation elsewhere in Asia Minor was apparently different, as Ibn Hauqal himself implies elsewhere in his book where he says that in the regions between Attaleia and Constantinople the traffic was never interrupted.

The testimony of the author of the *Hudūd al-'Ālam*, too, cannot be accepted on its face value because it is contradicted by another reference drawn from the same compilation. This other reference immediately follows the listing of the themes of the Empire such as Arab geographers knew them to have been about 845, and reads: "Each of these provinces (themes) is vast and has numerous towns, villages, castles, fortresses, mountains, running waters, and

<sup>17</sup> E. W. Brooks, "The Arabs in Asia Minor (641-750), from Arabic Sources," *JHS*, 18 (1898), 193, 194, 198, 199; *idem*, "Byzantines and Arabs in the Time of the Early Abbasids," *EHR*, 15 (1900), 734, 740, 745; Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1883), I, 345, 351, 353, 354, 382, 390, 395, 404, 411; Ibn Hauqal, *op. cit.*, I, 190 ("Ankara, grande ville en ruines"); Ibn Khordadbeh, *apud* H. Gelzer, *Die Genesis der byzantinischen Themenverfassung* (Leipzig, 1899), 83 ("la ville, actuellement ruinée, de Nicomédie"); A. A. Vasiliev, H. Grégoire, and M. Canard, *Byzance et les Arabes*, I (Brussels, 1935) (Amorion and Ancyra). See also Ahrweiler, *op. cit.*, 30 ff.

<sup>18</sup> M. Canard, *Miscellanea Orientalia* (London, 1973), study II ("L'impérialisme des Fatimides et leur propagande," originally published in 1947).

<sup>19</sup> Ibn Hauqal, *op. cit.*, I, 195: "L'empire byzantin apparaît à beaucoup de musulmans cultivés et d'auteurs d'ouvrages comme très différent de ce qu'il est en réalité. En effet, il est dans une situation précaire; sa puissance est insignifiante, ses revenus sont médiocres, ses populations d'humble condition, la richesse y est rare, ses finances sont mauvaises et ses ressources sont maigres... l'empire byzantin n'approche pas l'importance du Maghreb ni sa puissance..."

<sup>20</sup> Charanis, *Studies on the Demography*, study I, p. 8, where the sources, on the basis of which this estimate has been made, are given. I am told by those who have seen the existing ruins of Amorion that these ruins indicate a city too small to have had a population of 40,000. It must be pointed out, however, that Amorion was destroyed and rebuilt several times, and as a consequence the existing ruins most probably do not indicate at all the size of the city which existed in 838 before it was destroyed by the Arabs.

amenities.”<sup>21</sup> This reference precedes the one which says that the cities in Rūm had become few; it does not necessarily follow, however, that the conditions which it describes antedated those described by the latter reference. Moreover, there is this additional notice inserted at the end of the text relevant to the internal situation of the Byzantine Empire: “And these provinces, with large villages, and whatever there is (in them) of towns, are such as we have represented them and shown on the Map...” This text, according to the editor, is awkward: the words “villages” and “towns” ought to come in reverse order.<sup>22</sup> The text should read, therefore: “And these provinces, with large towns, and whatever there is (in them) of villages, are such as we have represented them and shown on the map.” In his references to towns in Byzantine Asia Minor, the author of the *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam* is obviously confused, probably because he drew them from different sources. These references do indicate, however, that at least by the second half of the ninth century there were not a few towns in Asia Minor. This is not to say, of course, that the Arabs had inflicted no permanent damage. Indeed, there were cities which failed to survive their depredations, or, if they did survive, were reduced to villages.<sup>23</sup>

I have listed above the Byzantine cities in Asia Minor which at one time or another had been captured by the Arabs, not one of which was held by them for any length of time. Whatever damage they did was repaired, at least to some extent, by the Byzantine authorities, rebuilding some cities from the ground, although sometimes on a lesser scale, as was the case with Amorion after its destruction in 838. In a homily probably delivered in 864, at the time of the inauguration by the Emperor Michael III of the Palatine church of Our Lady of the Pharos, the Byzantine Patriarch Photius declared that the Emperor “re-erected subject cities which have long lain low, and built others from the foundations, and repeopled others, and made the boundaries secure for the towns.”<sup>24</sup> This homily was delivered before, and addressed to, the Emperor; hence allowance should be made for rhetorical exaggerations. It is known from inscriptions, however, that Michael III, probably about 858–59, reconstructed Ancyra and also restored Nicaea.<sup>25</sup> Ancyra had been restored once before by Nicephorus I.<sup>26</sup> A number of cities not only survived the disturbances caused by the Arabs, but continued to be centers of commerce and industry of some importance. These included Attaleia, Ephesus, Smyrna, Nicaea, Nicomedia, Prusa, Heracleia Pontica, Amastris, and Trebizond.<sup>27</sup> Attaleia and Trebizond are particularly noted by Ibn Hauqal for their

<sup>21</sup> *Ḥudūd al-‘Ālam*, 156f.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 157 and note 2.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Ahrweiler, *op. cit.*, 30ff.

<sup>24</sup> C. Mango, *The Homilies of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople*, DOS, III (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), 185 and note 3.

<sup>25</sup> H. Grégoire, “Inscriptions historiques byzantines,” *Byzantion*, 4 (1927–28), 437–49. For Nicaea, see A. M. Schneider and W. Karnapp, *Die Stadtmauer von Iznik* (Nicaea) (Berlin, 1938), 51–52; A. M. Schneider, “The City Walls of Nicaea,” *Antiquity*, 12 (1938), 441.

<sup>26</sup> Cedrenus, *Historiarum Compendium*, Bonn ed. (1839), II, 34.

<sup>27</sup> For these and other towns, see S. Vryonis, Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley–Los Angeles, 1971), 10ff.

importance as sources of revenue.<sup>28</sup> About the size of the population of these cities nothing definite can be said. The population of Amorion on the eve of its devastation by the Arabs in 838 might have numbered close to 40,000, and Nicaea is said to have been well-peopled.<sup>29</sup> In general, however, these cities were relatively small, though no smaller perhaps than the central settlement of most of the cities of antiquity. Their population consisted of soldiers, ecclesiastics, the landed magnates of the surrounding countryside, peasants, and, of course, some craftsmen and merchants. In some cities, Attaleia and Trebizond, for instance, there were foreign merchants, while in others, notably Amorion, Attaleia, Ephesus, Nicomedia, and Synada, there dwelled also a number of Jews.<sup>30</sup>

Perhaps the most important function of the Byzantine city in Asia Minor was to serve as an outlet for the surrounding countryside and to offer it protection. Society in Asia Minor, as elsewhere in the Byzantine Empire, was predominately agrarian, with agriculture and animal-tending its most important economic activities and the principal sources of revenue for the state. The upheavals of the seventh century seriously affected the countryside, bringing about, among other things, important changes in its social structure. There are aspects of these changes which are by no means clear; but on the main point, that they involved the conversion of the majority of the peasantry into independent proprietors cultivating their own land, there can be little doubt.<sup>31</sup> For in contrast to the situation which obtained before the seventh century, it is the independent peasantry which dominated the agrarian scene in the period which followed. This point is made clear by a passage in the novel which the Emperor Romanus I issued in 934, precisely for the protection of the independent peasantry against the encroachments of the rich. The passage reads: "It is not through hatred and envy of the rich that we take these measures, but for the protection of the small and the safety of the Empire as a whole....The extension of the power of the strong...will bring about the irreparable loss of the public good, if the present law does not bring a check to it. For it is the many, settled on the land, who provide for the general needs, who pay the taxes and furnish the army with recruits. Everything fails when the many are wanting."<sup>32</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Ibn Hauqal, *op. cit.*, I, 192.

<sup>29</sup> "Niqiya; this is a large city in which there are many inhabitants": A. A. Vasiliev, "Harun-ibn-Yahya and his Description of Constantinople," *SemKond*, 5 (1932), 154, who says (note 30) that Niqiya here is Iconium, but Canard (Vasiliev, Grégoire, and Canard, *Byzance et les Arabes* [*supra*, note 17], II, 2, 383 note 3) suggests that it may be Nicaea or possibly Nacolein (*ibid.*, 434), southeast of Dorylaeum. But see Theophanes Continuatus, Bonn ed. (1838), 464, where Nicaea is referred to as rich and populous.

<sup>30</sup> J. Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire 641-1204* (Athens, 1939), 30, 109, 119, 121, 186, 191. Cf. Ahrweiler, *op. cit.*, 6 notes 6 and 7; Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 12. The Jewish communities in Asia Minor, however, could not have been very large, for the total Jewish population of the Empire does not appear to have exceeded 15,000; see Starr, *op. cit.*, 34ff.

<sup>31</sup> The literature on this point is considerable. For references, see P. Charanis, *Social, Economic and Political Life in the Byzantine Empire. Collected Studies* (London, 1973), study III (originally published in 1945); *idem*, *Studies on the Demography*, study IV (originally published in 1963).

<sup>32</sup> Zepos, *Jus* (Athens, 1931), I, 208-9. The novel is said to have been issued in September, 8th indiction, the year 6443 after the creation of the world; thus A.D. 934. For another date (928), *ibid.*, 206 note 6.



The text is quite clear. The "many," those who pay the taxes, provide for the general needs, and furnish the army with recruits, are the independent peasantry. They had been in existence already for some time and had rendered the Empire productive and prosperous. The prosperity of Asia Minor in the ninth century mentioned by Arab geographers was no doubt the work of this peasantry, among whom we must include the soldier-farmers who constituted the thematic armies.

Ancient Asia Minor comprised a variety of nationalities. The conquests of Alexander the Great brought it under Greek influence to a greater extent than ever before. Its Hellenization, promoted by the Seleucids and the Attalids, was further encouraged by the Romans, who brought the entire peninsula under their effective jurisdiction. Cicero called the Lycians Greeks,<sup>33</sup> and Strabo says that in his time Lydian had ceased to be spoken in Lydia itself, although it was still used along with Pisidian and Greek in Cibyra.<sup>34</sup> Greek, which in early Roman times was very much restricted to the towns and among the natives tended to be spoken only by the rich and the educated, in time spread into villages and hamlets and became the speech of the poor and the uneducated. No less an authority on Hellenism in Asia Minor than Louis Robert has this to say:

"The Greek culture was general in Lycaonia and in Phrygia, in the second and third centuries and during the Later Empire. The use of the Greek language was not at all restricted to a thin layer of the population, the upper class. The very 'coarseness' of many of the monuments—dedications and epitaphs—shows it, as well as the large number of these monuments, their density, and the variety of the social conditions, from freedmen to slaves, of those who executed them.... The dedications, so numerous and interesting, and the epitaphs were not drawn for a thin layer of rich citizens of the towns, but... for the peasants, well to do or poor, of the villages and hamlets."<sup>35</sup>

The dissemination of the Greek language among every layer of the native population of Asia Minor did not necessarily mean, of course, that the native languages ceased to be spoken. The question as to what extent these languages continued in use was most thoroughly studied by Karl Holl, who, with the exception of one or two references which were added later, had collected the relevant texts.<sup>36</sup> Chronologically, these texts fall within the first six centuries of the Christian era and refer to the following languages: Cappadocian, Celtic, Isaurian, Lycaonian, Mysian, and Phrygian. It may be presumed, therefore, that these languages were still spoken, at least to some extent, until the end of the sixth century. It is conceivable that some of these languages may have

<sup>33</sup> Cicero, *The Verrine Orations*, IV, 10.21, Loeb (London, 1928), II, 304: *Lycii, Graeci homines*. Cf. W. M. Ramsay, *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London, 1890), 19: "the græcising process had progressed very far in Lycia early in the first century B.C."

<sup>34</sup> Strabo, *The Geography*, XIII, 4.17, Loeb (London, 1960), XIII, 192.

<sup>35</sup> In his review of *MAMA*, VII, in *Hellenica*, 13 (1965), 53–54.

<sup>36</sup> "Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in Kleinasien in nachchristlicher Zeit," *Hermes*, 43 (1908), 240–54; P. Charanis, "Ethnic Changes in the Byzantine Empire in the Seventh Century," *DOP*, 13 (1959) (= *Studies on the Demography*, study II), 25–26 and the references given there. See also Vryonis (*op. cit.*, 44–48), who is right, I think, in questioning (46f.) the validity of one of the texts cited by Holl.

lingered on for some time longer, for languages do not die suddenly. How much longer cannot be known, but the chance that any one of them survived much beyond the eighth century is very slim indeed. One more point: in the very early centuries of Christianity there appeared a number of heresies in Asia Minor. By the end of the eighth century, however, some of these heretical groups disappeared; others lost their vitality and merged with other sects which showed up later. Holl's view, therefore, that the adherents of these heresies were native speakers, and as a consequence their existence should be taken as proof of the continued use of native languages, however valid it may be for the Early Christian centuries, has no significance for the later period.<sup>37</sup>

There is, however, another aspect of the linguistic evolution of Byzantine Asia Minor than the final and absolute triumph of Greek over the ancient native languages of the peninsula. Between the foundation of Constantinople and the end of the eighth century, Asia Minor underwent some changes in its ethnic composition, brought about by the settlement of new peoples. Goths were settled toward the end of the fourth century and Vandals and perhaps more Goths in the sixth.<sup>38</sup> When the Arabs took Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, many orthodox Christians fled to the Byzantine Empire and were settled most probably in Asia Minor.<sup>39</sup> Toward the end of the seventh century Justinian II removed the Mardaites from Lebanon and settled some of them in the region of Attaleia.<sup>40</sup> The same Emperor also settled thousands of Slavs in Bithynia. More Slavs, 208,000 according to one chronicler, were brought over into Asia Minor in 762, where they landed on the Black Sea coast of Bithynia, but apparently were later dispersed throughout Asia Minor.<sup>41</sup>

The Slavs, as they finally achieved some stability as settlers in Byzantine Asia Minor, may have numbered perhaps close to 300,000.<sup>42</sup> No figures can be given for the other new settlers. In general, however, they seem to have been relatively few, numbering into hundreds, in some cases into thousands, but most probably never into tens of thousands. To be sure, the Mardaites

<sup>37</sup> Charanis, "Ethnic Changes," 26f., where I agree with Holl. But actually there is no evidence to indicate that any of these heretical groups survived much beyond the sixth century and, if they did so, that their language was not Greek. Cf. Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 59f., where Holl's view is questioned.

<sup>38</sup> E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, French trans. J. R. Palanque (Paris, 1959), 194-95; Procopius, *De bello Vandalico*, II, 14.17, Loeb (London, 1916), II, 330f.

<sup>39</sup> Charanis, "Ethnic Changes," 28 and note 25. See also Mgr. A. Scher, ed., *Histoire Nestorienne (Chronique de Séert)*, PO, XIII (Paris, 1919), 627: "La plupart des habitants de ces régions [Syria] se réfugièrent à l'intérieur de l'empire grec, laissant leurs propriétés." The sources do not state that these refugees came to Asia Minor, but Asia Minor, with Attaleia as a port of landing, was the most likely place. In the ninth century many Christians came to Attaleia from Palestine: Συλλογή παλαιστινῆς καὶ συριακῆς ἀγιολογίας, ed. M. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus (= Pravoslavnyj palestinskij sbornik', XIX, 3 [57]) (St. Petersburg, 1907), 193; cf. F. Halkin, "Saint Antoine le Jeune et Pétronas le vainqueur des Arabes en 863," *AnalBoll*, 62 (1944), 188.

<sup>40</sup> Theophanes, *op. cit.*, I, 363; Honigmann, *op. cit.*, 41; K. Amantos, Μαρδαῖται, in *Ἑλληνικά*, 5 (1932), 130-36.

<sup>41</sup> On the settlement of Slavs in Asia Minor, see P. Charanis, "The Slavic Element in Byzantine Asia Minor in the Thirteenth Century," *Byzantion*, 18 (1946-48) (= *Studies on the Demography*, study VII and author's preface); *idem*, "Ethnic Changes," 42-43.

<sup>42</sup> This is a liberal estimate which I base on the figure 208,000, the number of Slavs living in Asia Minor in 762, and some indefinite elements.

who had been removed from Lebanon are said to have numbered 12,000, but not all of them definitely settled in Asia Minor.<sup>43</sup> There were still in the seventh, eighth, and early part of the ninth century Armenians in Byzantine Asia Minor, but as a people they were restricted to Little Armenia, with Comana the westernmost point of their influence. The famous Armenian-Byzantine family of the Skleroi were originally natives of this part of Byzantine Asia Minor. Only two Armenian colonies, at Pergamon and at Priene, are known to have existed in western Asia Minor during this period.<sup>44</sup>

The language spoken by the new settlers when they were first brought over into Byzantine Asia Minor was, of course, their native tongue. The Christians, who may have come from Syria and Egypt following the conquests of these lands by the Arabs, were no doubt orthodox and, as a consequence, most probably Greek speakers. The Mardaites, too, were orthodox, and whatever the language they spoke when they first came they eventually abandoned in favor of Greek.<sup>45</sup> The Goths are not mentioned again until the beginning of the eighth century when they are referred to as Graeco-Goths, a sure indication that by then they had become Greek speakers.<sup>46</sup> There is no mention of the Vandals until 820 when they are said to have been included in the army of Thomas the Slavonian when he rebelled against Michael II.<sup>47</sup> There is much which relates to the ethnic composition of Thomas' army which may have had no relevance at all to the actual situation,<sup>48</sup> but if the Vandals mentioned in that army were indeed descendants of the Vandals whom Justinian had settled in Asia Minor, the chances are that they spoke Greek. For the original Vandals had not been settled in some isolated spot but in the cities, where they enrolled in the army and adopted Orthodoxy. This means that they circulated in groups where Greek was spoken, and in time, if not they themselves, certainly their descendants must have become Greek speakers.

The Slavs, too, began to yield very early to the process of Hellenization. Thomas the Slavonian is said to have been eloquent, no doubt in Greek, for the reference is in connection with his public career.<sup>49</sup> The monk Ioannikes (754-846), keeper of hogs, soldier, and finally monk, was, as Speros Vryonis has shown, a Hellenized Slav.<sup>50</sup> In the case of Thomas the army, and in the case of Ioannikes the army and the Church, were the forces which contributed to Hellenization. But the milieu also played an important role. Isolated from the general body of Slavdom, converted early to Christianity, and exposed to the Greek language and letters, the Slavs of Asia Minor in

<sup>43</sup> See *supra*, note 40.

<sup>44</sup> P. Charanis, *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire* (Lisbon, 1963), 13, 16, 19f. On the origin of the family of the Skleroi, see *idem*, "The Chronicle of Monemvasia and the Question of the Slavonic Settlements in Greece," *DOP*, 5 (1950) (= *Studies on the Demography*, study X), 147, 152.

<sup>45</sup> Honigsmann, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 1), 41.

<sup>46</sup> Theophanes, *op. cit.*, I, 385; "Acta Graeca SS. Davidis, Symeonis et Georgii," *AnalBoll*, 18 (1899), 256.

<sup>47</sup> Genesius, *Historiae*, Bonn ed. (1834), 33.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. P. Lemerle, "Thomas le Slave," *TM*, 1 (1965), 265 note 36.

<sup>49</sup> Genesius, *op. cit.*, 32; cf. Lemerle, *op. cit.*, 265.

<sup>50</sup> "St. Ioannicius the Great (754-846) and the 'Slavs' of Bithynia," *Byzantion*, 31 (1961), 245ff.

time abandoned their language and became Greek speakers.<sup>51</sup> The process of Hellenization was not, of course, completed overnight, but by the end of the ninth century it must have gone very far.<sup>52</sup> By this time, except in some districts on the eastern frontier including those newly settled by Armenians, Greek, which for centuries had been the language of the state, of the army, of the Church, and of the educated, had become the everyday speech of virtually everyone throughout Byzantine Asia Minor.

Orthodoxy, perhaps more than the Greek language, gave to the Byzantine Empire the principal element of its cultural character. Orthodoxy, however, was also not shaped overnight. Monophysitism, which in the fifth and sixth centuries shook the Oriental provinces of the Empire, touched Asia Minor but did not affect it profoundly.<sup>53</sup> Iconoclasm originated in Constantinople and of course it affected Asia Minor, but the accuracy of the belief that it was caused by social and cultural factors peculiar to Asia Minor has not been demonstrated.<sup>54</sup> There is really no proof that the two bishops of Asia Minor, Constantine of Nacoleia and Thomas of Claudiopolis, who are said to have influenced Leo III, were themselves moved by hostility to the icons indigenous to their provinces.<sup>55</sup> The statement of the Patriarch Germanus in his letter to Thomas of Claudiopolis that Thomas' iconoclastic measures had thrown entire cities and a multitude of peoples into a state of turbulence implies the existence of strong sentiment in favor of the cult of images rather than the opposite.<sup>56</sup> The cult of images had by then made decisive progress in Asia Minor, more perhaps than in any other region of the empire.<sup>57</sup> It may be, therefore, that the Iconoclasm of bishops Constantine and Thomas involved nothing more than the personal reactions, based on the Old Testament prohibition of images, of these two bishops against this progress, with no reference at all to any other conditions.<sup>58</sup> The issue of Iconoclasm was fought in Con-

<sup>51</sup> F. Dvornik, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1926), 102; Charanis, "The Slavic Element" (*supra*, note 41), 77ff.

<sup>52</sup> In the tenth century, there were Slavs in Bithynia whose ability to communicate in Slavic with Slavs settled in the Peloponnesus, with the object of inflicting damage on the Empire, caused some concern. These Slavs were enrolled soldiers, not numerous, and most probably in no way related to the Slavs who had settled in Bithynia in the eighth century. See the review of my article, "The Slavic Element in Byzantine Asia Minor" (*supra*, note 41), by G. Soules in *Επ.Ετ.Βυλ.Σπ.*, 19 (1949), 339.

<sup>53</sup> Monophysitism made some progress in Asia Minor early in the sixth century when Severus was bishop of Antioch, but with the deposition of Severus in 518 a decline set in which ended eventually in the extinction of Monophysitism in Asia Minor; see E. Honigmann, *Evêques et évêchés monophysites d'Asie antérieure au VI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, CSCO, 127, *Subsidia*, 2 (Louvain, 1951), 108ff.

<sup>54</sup> See, for instance, A. Grabar, *L'iconoclisme byzantin: Dossier archéologique* (Paris, 1957), 93ff.; Ahrweiler, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 6); P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris, 1971), 31ff.

<sup>55</sup> On the possible role of these bishops, see G. Ostrogorsky, "Les débuts de la Querelle des Images," *Mélanges Charles Diehl* (Paris, 1930), I, 235-38.

<sup>56</sup> PG, 98, col. 184.

<sup>57</sup> On the progress of image-worship by the end of the seventh century, see the brilliant study by E. Kitzinger, "The Cult of Images in the Age before Iconoclasm," *DOP*, 8 (1954), 85-150.

<sup>58</sup> "In short, as far as one can judge, the Asia Minor bishops merely appealed to some obvious anti-idolatry passages in Scripture, and were probably moved to action by the honor, in their opinion excessive, paid to icons": S. Gero, *Byzantine Iconoclasm during the Reign of Leo III, with Particular Attention to the Oriental Sources*, CSCO, 346, *Subsidia*, 41 (Louvain, 1973), 105. (My statement on Iconoclasm was written before I had read Gero's book.) See also P. Brown, "A Dark-Age Crisis: Aspects of the Iconoclastic Controversy," *EHR*, 88 (1973), 26: "It is not surprising that the crisis was

stantinople and in Asia Minor, but this carries no special significance because for all practical purposes Constantinople and Asia Minor constituted virtually the entire effective territorial extent of the Greek Church. Unlike Monophysitism, which continued to persist in the provinces, where it was strong, Iconoclasm, despite the rigorous measures taken to enforce it, was eliminated, a sure indication that its roots were not deep. By the end of the ninth century all vestiges of Iconoclasm disappeared; the icon returned to stay, rooting itself more deeply in Asia Minor than in any other region of the Empire.

There is, however, another side to the religious situation in Byzantine Asia Minor. Early Christian Asia Minor was as much a mosaic of sects as of nationalities though, of course, sects and nationalities were not synonymous. W. M. Calder, who devoted a special study to the epigraphy of these sects, has very well described the situation. "Anatolia," he wrote, "was indeed notorious in the early Church as a hot-bed of heresies; here heresy flourished luxuriantly; heretical churches established themselves freely all over the peninsula, and heretical leaders competed with the orthodox bishops for the headship of many Christian communities."<sup>59</sup> A number of these heretical groups are known by name. The size of each of them is impossible to determine, but they continued to exist, at least some of them, for a long time. The Novatians, Montanists, and Tetradites are mentioned in canon 95 of the Council in Trullo (692).<sup>60</sup> The same canon refers to "many heresies whose origin was Galatia." The Montanists are said to have existed until the reign of Leo III, when they chose to destroy themselves rather than submit to the baptism which Leo III had ordered them to undergo.<sup>61</sup> The Tetradites continued to exist much longer. They are mentioned by Theophanes,<sup>62</sup> who says that they were tolerated by the Emperor Nicephorus I, and again by Photius in one of his homilies where he speaks of their conversion to Orthodoxy.<sup>63</sup> The Encratites and the Apotactites, though mentioned in canon 95 of the Council in Trullo, most probably had ceased to be active sometime before then. The Novatians apparently merged with the Montanists and disappeared with them early in the eighth century.<sup>64</sup>

In the meantime, however, two new heresies made their appearance: the Athinganoi and the Paulicians. The Athinganoi, by virtue of their beliefs, constituted a strange sect, mentioned for the first time in the compilation

---

first felt in western provinces of Asia Minor. This was not because Iconoclasm had strong local roots in these areas. Far from it: it was Iconodulism which had the local roots...." The idea that the iconoclastic emperors sought to eliminate the image of Christ in order to enhance the value of their own as the symbol of their authority on earth continues to have its adherents: L. W. Barnard, "The Emperor Cult and the Origins of the Iconoclastic Controversy," *Byzantion*, 43 (1974), 13-29.

<sup>59</sup> "The Epigraphy of the Anatolian Heresies," *Anatolian Studies presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay* (London, 1923), 60.

<sup>60</sup> Mansi, XI, 984.

<sup>61</sup> Theophanes, *op. cit.*, I, 401. For other texts, Starr, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 30), 91-92.

<sup>62</sup> Theophanes, *op. cit.*, I, 496.

<sup>63</sup> Homily XVII, Mango, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 24), 279-96.

<sup>64</sup> On these heresies, see further J. Gouillard, "L'hérésie dans l'empire byzantin des origines au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *TM*, 1 (1965), 299-312. Cf. Charanis, "Ethnic Changes," 26-27; Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism* (note 27 *supra*), 55-60.

of the presbyter Timothy at the beginning of the seventh century and again by the Patriarch Germanus in the first half of the eighth century.<sup>65</sup> By the beginning of the ninth century, the Athinganoi, originally located in Phrygia, increased to such a degree, probably by merging with other sects, that they spread into Lycaonia.<sup>66</sup> Michael II was said to have inherited from his parents the beliefs of the Athinganoi, and Nicephorus I was accused of being friendly to both them and the Paulicians.<sup>67</sup> During the reign of Michael I the imperial authorities were persuaded to take action against the Athinganoi; they were either exterminated or driven out of their homes, and some were settled on the island of Aegina where the natives referred to them as aliens, a term which in this instance can only mean that they were not indigenous to Aegina.<sup>68</sup> The Athinganoi do not, thereafter, disappear entirely from the records, but as an active heresy they ceased to be of any significance.<sup>69</sup>

The Paulicians constituted a sect which was brought to Byzantine Asia Minor from Armenia. There are points in the history of the sect and its beliefs which are by no means clear; scholars differ widely about these points and also about the nature of the sources.<sup>70</sup> But on the salient points of interest to this discussion, there is general agreement both in the sources and among those who have studied them. The first Paulicians came to the Armenian regions of the Armeniakon theme, settling around Koloneia sometime during the second half of the seventh century. There they spread their faith, winning many converts. During the second half of the eighth century, one of their leaders moved to Antioch in Pisidia, where he possibly made converts to Paulicianism, but on this point the sources give no information. The Paulicians suffered persecutions under Constantine IV and Justinian II, and quite possibly also under Philippicus (711–13), but for the rest of the eighth century they were apparently tolerated. The sect spread throughout the districts of Koloneia and Neo-Caesarea, but under Michael I and perhaps also Leo V they were subjected to the same persecution which was directed against the Athinganoi; many were killed, but many more fled to the Arabs who permitted them to establish their own stronghold. The final blow was struck in 843 under Theodora, regent for Michael III. It is said that 100,000

<sup>65</sup> Timothy, Presbyter of Constantinople, *De Receptione Haereticorum*, PG, 86, col. 33; Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, *De Haeresibus et Synodis*, PG, 98, col. 85.

<sup>66</sup> Theophanes, *op. cit.*, I, 495; Genesius, *op. cit.*, 32; Theophanes Continuatus, 42.

<sup>67</sup> Theophanes, *op. cit.*, I, 488; Theophanes Continuatus, 42.

<sup>68</sup> *The Life of Saint Athanasia of Aegina*, *Acta SS, August*, III (1867), 170E. On the Athinganoi, see J. Starr, "An Eastern Christian Sect: the Athinganoi," *HThR*, 29,2 (1936), 93–106; Gouillard, *op. cit.*, 304–7, 309–12.

<sup>69</sup> Gouillard, *op. cit.*, 315–16.

<sup>70</sup> The Greek texts on the Paulicians have now been brought together in a critical edition with a French translation by Ch. Astruc, W. Conus-Wolska, J. Gouillard, P. Lemerle, D. Papachrysanthou, and J. Paramelle, *TM*, 4 (1970), 3–227. Furthermore, Nina G. Garsoian has analyzed the Armenian texts and reconstructed the history of the Paulicians in Armenia and in Byzantine Asia Minor: *The Paulician Heresy: A Study of the Origin and Development of Paulicianism in Armenia and the Eastern Provinces of the Byzantine Empire* (The Hague–Paris, 1967). The most recent reconstruction of the history of the Paulicians in Byzantine Asia Minor is that of P. Lemerle, who gives in addition a summary of the literature on the subject: "Histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques," *TM*, 5 (1973), 1–144. My own account and, of course, my own judgment are based on these works.

died on that occasion, and their properties were confiscated; those who survived sought asylum among the Arabs, joining their coreligionists who had previously found refuge there. Thereafter, the struggle against the Paulicians became purely military, since by then they had become a foreign power. When in 872 Tephrike, their most powerful stronghold, was captured and destroyed by the Byzantines, their role in the life of Byzantine Asia Minor came to an end. "With the destruction of Tephrike," writes Nina Garsoian, "the history of the Paulicians within the imperial provinces of the East comes to an end, and the subsequent history of the sect must be sought in the Balkans or beyond the Euphrates in its homeland of Armenia."<sup>71</sup> With the end of Paulicianism soon after the suppression of Iconoclasm and the virtual disappearance of every other heresy, Byzantine Asia Minor became the center of Orthodoxy.

It is now time to collate this series of long notes, the objective of which by now should have become quite clear. They show that by the end of the ninth century Asia Minor had sufficient manpower, and a social structure in which there was some motivation for the masses, to enable it effectively to exploit its resources, so that it became the principal source of men and money for the state. They show further that by the end of the same century Asia Minor was shaped into the new nation of the *Romioi*, composed of Hellenistic, Roman, and other elements, with the Greek language and Orthodoxy as the two dominant ingredients of its culture. These economic, social, and cultural features of Asia Minor evolved in the midst of war as powerful factors in the successful struggle for survival, and were still more powerful in the wars of expansion which, by the end of the first quarter of the eleventh century, turned the Empire into the greatest power in Europe and the Near East.

The Arabs, writes Marius Canard, "refused to see in the victories of the Byzantines anything other than the result of a weakening of the spirit of Islam, of the negligence and immorality of its sovereigns. . . . But the decadence of the Abbasids was only a secondary factor in the development of events, only an auxiliary for the Byzantines. It was in itself that Byzantium found again the source of its strength. This revival of vigor which animated the empire in the tenth century was the work of a few men of worth: emperors, ministers, generals; it was also the work of the people themselves. . . imbued with the same religious faith and the grandeur of the Roman imperial idea, and organized politically, socially, and economically at least as solidly as its adversary. This people did not just live lazily on its ancient foundation; like its civil and military institutions which never ceased to improve, it rejuvenated itself and evolved. In the victorious resistance to the empire of the Caliphs, much of the credit must go to the people of Anatolia and to the Armenian element which had immigrated to the empire. . . ."<sup>72</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Garsoian, *op. cit.*, 130. There are indications, however, that some Paulicians continued to live in Byzantine Asia Minor, but their numbers could not have been significant. Cf. Lemerle, "Histoire des Pauliciens," 109-10.

<sup>72</sup> *Histoire de la Dynastie des H'amdanides de Jazîra et de Syrie* (Paris, 1951), 718-19.

The population of Byzantine Asia Minor as it had evolved by the end of the ninth century did not last much beyond the end of the tenth century. Its decadence is indeed one of the primary aspects of the social life of Asia Minor in the eleventh century. Ostrogorsky, in one of his more recent studies on the agrarian structure of the Empire, has analyzed three documents, each of which, in his opinion, represents a stage in the evolution of that society:<sup>73</sup> the *Farmer's Law*, compiled toward the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century; the *Treatise on Taxation*, a document of the second half of the tenth century; and the *Tax Register of Thebes*, belonging to the second half of the eleventh century. There would be no question at all about the validity of Ostrogorsky's arguments if the documents he analyzed were all specific and referred to one and the same locality. This is not the case, and as a consequence the validity of his analysis may be argued, but there can be no question at all concerning his final conclusion: that by the end of the eleventh century the independent peasantry virtually ceased to exist, because their property had been absorbed by the landed magnates and they had been reduced to a state of dependency. The process of this absorption had already begun toward the end of the ninth century when the landed magnates, the titled aristocracy, and those who occupied the important military and political offices of the state appear in the records as one class, the *δυνατοί* (the powerful) of the Byzantine legal texts. This process occurred throughout the Empire, but the majority of the magnates were from Asia Minor and it was there that their estates were located. These estates were vast, in one instance extending as far as 71.5 miles.<sup>74</sup> The emperors of the tenth century tried hard to check this process, but in the end they failed.

The fate of the independent peasantry also befell the soldier-farmers who for centuries had made up the thematic armies, the core of the military organization of the Empire. Their estates were also absorbed by the landed magnates and they were reduced to dependency. The effect of this was, of course, to undermine the strength of the thematic armies. Meanwhile, a series of blows against the military leaders, virtually all of whom were magnates of Asia Minor, weakened the source from which the state had been drawing its army and administrative officers.

The first blow was struck by Basil II, one of the most military of the Byzantine emperors. Basil had barely managed on two different occasions to save his throne from two of the most powerful magnates of Asia Minor, one a Skleros and the other a Phocas, two families which had distinguished themselves in the military and administrative life of the Empire. He resolved, therefore, to destroy the political and military influence of the magnates as a class in two ways: by confiscating their properties and confining them in the capital, and by taxation. When after 987 Basil was reconciled with Bardas

<sup>73</sup> G. Ostrogorsky, "La commune rurale byzantine. Loi agraire—traité fiscal—cadastre de Thèbes," *Byzantion*, 32 (1962), 139–66.

<sup>74</sup> E. Honigsmann, "Un itinéraire arabe à travers le Pont," *AIPHOS*, 4 (1936) (= *Melanges Franz Cumont*, I), 270f.



Skleros, one of the magnates who had tried to seize his throne, the latter advised him that if he wished to preserve the imperial authority he should permit none of the magnates to prosper and should exhaust their means by heavy taxation.<sup>75</sup> In 1002, by instituting the law on the *allelengyon*, which required magnates to pay the tax arrears of peasants too poor to meet their own obligations, Basil tried to put this advice into effect.<sup>76</sup> After the death of Basil the law on the *allelengyon* was repealed, but a certain distrust of the military persisted. This is strikingly illustrated by the fact that in 1026, when Alexius of Studium was patriarch, a synodal decision was obtained pronouncing anathema against all rebels and excommunicating priests who might admit them to communion.<sup>77</sup> This distrust eventually became a government policy when every effort was made to eliminate the military from the administration of the state. This policy was indeed the characteristic feature of the reigns of Constantine IX Monomachus and, after the short interval when the military once more controlled the throne during the reign of Isaac Comnenus, of Constantine X Ducas.<sup>78</sup>

The decadence of the soldier-farmers and the blows struck against the military so undermined the strength and prestige of the Byzantine army that to serve in it ceased to be attractive. The profession of soldier, which in the great days of the ninth and tenth centuries carried prestige, honor, and position, had no longer any value and so, as Cedrenus explains, "the soldiers put aside their arms and became lawyers or jurists."<sup>79</sup> The same author, writing of the army that took the field against the Seljuks in 1071, says: "The army was composed of Macedonians and Bulgarians and Cappadocians, Uzi, Franks and Varangians, and other barbarians who happened to be about. There were gathered also those who were in Phrygia (Θέμα ἀνατολικῶν). And what one saw in them was something incredible. The renowned champions of the Romans who had reduced into subjection all of the east and the west now numbered only a few and these were bowed down by poverty and ill treatment. They lacked in weapons, swords, and other arms, such as javelins and scythes...they lacked also in cavalry and other equipment, for the emperor had not taken the field for a long time. For this reason they were regarded as useless and unnecessary and their wages and maintenance were reduced."<sup>80</sup> The thematic armies of Asia Minor were for all practical purposes replaced by mercenaries drawn from among foreign peoples: Russians, Turks, Alans, English, Normans, Germans, Pechenegs, and Bulgars, who were strangers to the cultural traditions of the Empire and were likely to be swayed,

<sup>75</sup> Michael Psellos, *Chronographie*, ed. and French trans. E. Renauld (Paris, 1926), I, 17ff.

<sup>76</sup> Skylitzes, *Synopsis Historiarum*, ed. I. Thurn (Berlin, 1973), 347; cf. F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, I (Munich, 1924), 102, no. 793.

<sup>77</sup> Zepos, *Jus*, I, 273.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Charanis, "On the Social Structure of the Later Roman Empire," *Byzantion*, 17 (1944-45), 54f.; *idem*, "The Byzantine Empire in the Eleventh Century," in *A History of the Crusades*, eds. K. M. Setton and M. W. Baldwin, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia, 1969) (= Charanis, *Social, Economic and Political Life* [*supra*, note 31], study XVI), 195f.

<sup>79</sup> *Historiarum Compendium*, II, 652.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 668.

as indeed they were, more by their own private interests than by those of the Empire.<sup>81</sup> The harm which they did was much greater than the services they rendered. The Uzi, for instance, deserted to the enemy at the battle of Mantzikert, which greatly contributed to the defeat of the Byzantine forces.<sup>82</sup> And among the Norman chieftains in the service of the Empire in Asia Minor, Hervé deserted to the Turks in 1057, Crispin openly rebelled in 1068, and Roussel of Bailleul, after playing a dubious role at Mantzikert, tried to carve out a principality for himself in Asia Minor.<sup>83</sup> The Seljuk Turks who established themselves in the various cities in central and western Anatolia had come there as mercenaries in the service of Byzantine generals during the period of the civil wars which followed Mantzikert.<sup>84</sup>

The Byzantine defeat at Mantzikert was the immediate and direct cause of the breakdown of Byzantine authority in Asia Minor. The depressed conditions of the Byzantine army and the dubious role of the mercenaries were the two factors most responsible, at least from the Byzantine side, for the Byzantine defeat. These two factors, however, were the product of a much more fundamental development: the breakdown in the solidarity of the people of Asia Minor. That solidarity had been forged from two elements: a social structure in which the agrarian population consisted predominantly of a free and independent peasantry, and a relative cultural uniformity characterized by Greek as the language of daily speech and Orthodoxy as the accepted religion of the land. I have already stated that the changes in the social structure which took place in the course of the tenth and eleventh centuries undermined the strength of the army and contributed greatly to its deterioration, and that this deterioration was an important factor in the Byzantine defeat at Mantzikert and its disastrous aftereffects.<sup>85</sup> Equally damaging, however, if indeed not more so, was the breakdown of the cultural uniformity which had gone into building the solidarity of the people of Asia Minor.

<sup>81</sup> Already at Mantzikert the mercenary forces occupied a very important position in the Byzantine army: C. Cahen, "La compagne de Mantzikert d'après les sources musulmanes," *Byzantion*, 9 (1934), 629. After Mantzikert the mercenaries dominated almost completely. The armies of Alexius Comnenus, for instance, were composed of Russians, Turks, Alans, English, Franks, Germans, Bulgarians, and others: Zepos, *Jus*, I, 317; P. Lemerle, A. Guillou, and N. Svoronos, *Archives de l'Athos*. V: *Actes de Lavra*, I (Paris, 1970), 218, 243. Cf. H. Grégoire, "Les corps de troupe de l'armée d'Alexis Comnène," *Byzantion*, 14 (1939), 280-83; J. Shepard, "The English and Byzantium: A Study of their Role in the Byzantine Army in the Later Eleventh Century," *Traditio*, 29 (1973), 51-92.

<sup>82</sup> Charanis, "The Byzantine Empire in the Eleventh Century," 192.

<sup>83</sup> For a good monograph on these Normans as Byzantine mercenaries, see G. Schlumberger, "Deux chefs normands des armées byzantines au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle," *RH*, 16 (1881), 289-303; L. Bréhier, "Les aventures d'un chef normand en Orient," *Revue de cours et conférence de la faculté des lettres de Paris*, 20 (1911), 172-88.

<sup>84</sup> Charanis, "The Byzantine Empire in the Eleventh Century," 201.

<sup>85</sup> In an extremely interesting article, "Byzantium, 1081-1204: An Economic Reappraisal," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. 5, vol. 20 (1970), 31-52, M. F. Hendy has tried to show that Byzantium was much more prosperous in the eleventh and twelfth centuries than it had been before. He puts the emphasis on the expansion of commerce and industry and points to the development of towns during this period. "Byzantine economic life was expanding rapidly throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries; and that despite the beginnings of political reverses under the Angeli (and mercenaries and magnates notwithstanding), this expansion may have only come to an end with the Fourth Crusade" (p. 52). It should be observed, however, that the development Hendy discusses was associated with the European provinces of the Empire, not with Asia Minor. Cf. Charanis, *Studies on the Demography*, study I, pp. 15-16.

The wars of expansion during the tenth and early part of the eleventh centuries brought under the jurisdiction of the Empire in Asia Minor extensive territories inhabited, in the words of a native Cappadocian, by "alien nations with strange religion and tongue."<sup>86</sup> These peoples, Semites, Armenians, and Georgians, separated from the Empire for centuries, were strangers to the cultural tradition which had evolved in Byzantine Asia Minor and were by no means inclined to accommodate themselves to it. This was particularly true of the Armenians, many of whom had found their way, either voluntarily or by force, into regions of Asia Minor, beyond their native land which was now under the domination of Byzantium.<sup>87</sup> As a result, the position of the Empire was weakened in the regions where, for instance in Cappadocia, their settlement disturbed the social and ethnic complexion and so created serious tensions,<sup>88</sup> or, for instance in Cilicia, the new settlers were ready to start separatist movements the moment the opportunity presented itself. The ecclesiastical problems created by the annexation of the Armenian lands and the dispersion of the population particularly contributed to the tension between the Armenians and the rest of Asia Minor. For the first time since the loss of Egypt and Syria in the seventh century, there was a powerful religious minority, dominant in certain regions of Asia Minor, very strong in others. Both Church and State were very much concerned about this situation and, as a consequence, pressured the non-orthodox population, especially the Armenians, to accept the orthodox point of view. But the Armenians, whose cultural and national development was strongly associated with their religious beliefs and practices, resisted stubbornly. The Armenians were also embittered by the trickery sometimes used by the Byzantines to obtain concessions from their princes, and by the way the latter had been removed from their native land and settled elsewhere in Asia Minor. This bitterness at times reached a degree of intensity that provoked atrocious acts; for example, that of Kagik, the deposed King of Ani, who had the Greek bishop of Caesaria seized and put into a sack with his large dog, and then had his men beat them until the maddened animal tore his master to shreds. Kagik did this ostensibly because the bishop had named his dog "Armenian,"<sup>89</sup> but in reality because he had come to hate the Greeks and the Greek Church, perhaps with some justification.

Armenians had been in the service of the Empire for centuries and had served remarkably well; indeed, in a sense, they made the Empire.<sup>90</sup> But the Armenians, at least those who had achieved high position, had accepted

<sup>86</sup> S. Vryonis, Jr., "The Will of a Provincial Magnate, Eustathius Boilas (1059)," *DOP*, 11 (1957), 264.

<sup>87</sup> Charanis, *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire* (*supra*, note 44), 28 ff.

<sup>88</sup> On these tensions, see further S. Vryonis, Jr., "Byzantium: The Social Basis of Decline in the Eleventh Century," *GRBS*, vol. 2, no. 2 (1959) (= *idem*, *Byzantium: its Internal History and Relations with the Muslim World. Collected Studies* [London, 1971], study II), 168 ff.

<sup>89</sup> Matthew of Edessa, *Chronique*, trans. from Armenian by E. Dulaurier (Paris, 1858), 152-54.

<sup>90</sup> Charanis, *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*, 57: "one may refer to the Byzantine empire of these two centuries (ninth and tenth) as Graeco-Armenian; 'Graeco' because, as always, its civilization was Greek, 'Armenian' because the element which directed its destinies and provided the greater part of the forces for its defense was largely Armenian or of Armenian origin."

Byzantine culture and identified themselves with its interests. They became members of the *Romioi*. This was not the case, however, with the Armenians of the eleventh century. Not in the least integrated, these Armenians had no attachment to the Empire, nor did they care for its culture. Both as soldiers and as civilians they proved to be dubious subjects. In the expedition which resulted in the battle of Mantzikert, Romanus IV Diogenes, the Byzantine emperor, had to take special measures to protect his troops from the attacks of the Armenian civilian population,<sup>91</sup> and in the battle itself the Armenian contingents deserted the Byzantine cause.<sup>92</sup> After the battle, Armenians founded principalities of their own in what had been Byzantine territories, and Armenians helped the Danishmends to seize Sebasteia and Melitene.<sup>93</sup>

The collapse of Byzantine power in Asia Minor was the result of a combination of forces: the vigor and the methods of operation of the external enemy; the changes in the social structure of Byzantine Asia Minor; the deterioration of the Byzantine thematic armies; the absence of aggressive leadership in Byzantium;<sup>94</sup> and finally, but by no means least in significance, the breakdown of the cultural cohesiveness of Byzantine Asia Minor.

Rutgers University

<sup>91</sup> Attaliates, *Historia*, ed. Bonn (1853), 135.

<sup>92</sup> Michael the Syrian, *Chronique*, trans. J. B. Chabot, III (Paris, 1905), 169; cf. Attaliates, *op. cit.*, 113.

<sup>93</sup> Irene Melikoff, *La geste de Melik Danismend, Etude critique du Danismendname*. I: *Introduction et Traduction* (Paris, 1960), 90, 126, especially 129.

<sup>94</sup> The efficiency of the Byzantine army "depended upon the quality of its generals. Constantinople was happy during some centuries to have a series of excellent commanders, such as for instance the generals of Justinianus, Belisarius and Narses in the 6th century, the Isaurian emperors in the 8th century, John Curcuas, the members of the Phocas family and the Sclerus families, John Tzimiskes, and Basil II Bulgaroctonos in the 9th to 11th centuries. Ultimately we must not forget the emperors of the Komnenian dynasty": Ada B. Hoffmeyer, "Military Equipment in the Byzantine Manuscript of Scylitzes in Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid," *Gladius*, 5 (1966), 22. No such statement can be made for the critical period between the death of Basil II in 1025 and the accession to the throne of Alexius I Comnenus in 1081. The failure of Byzantium during this period was in part at least the failure of leadership. Cf. Charanis, "The Byzantine Empire in the Eleventh Century" (*supra*, note 78), 194ff.